GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

190

(Local Boards)

File No. 1 of 1903-04

Serial Nos. ~~5261-1~~
Collection C 1

BC

Papers Filed.

Month

SUBJECT.

Payment of Rs 10-5-6 to the contractor by the District Board, Bangalore, being the ~~amount still due for~~ work done in sinking a well in the Kankanhally Taluq.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
	~~Sl. No. 8 of~~ Coll. C 2 of this file

G. R. S. 59.

Note

Letter no 1269 of 14-5-03 from the President of the D.F Board, Bangalore Circle, requesting sanction to pay the Contractor Rs 10-15-6. being the difference of the amount between the work actually turned out and payment made to him, on sinking a well in the Kankanhally Ig.

—"—

The President states, that he sanctioned on July 1898 an Estimate for Rs 293 from D. F, for sinking a well in the Kankanhalli Ig; that only Rs 218-7-2 was actually paid to the Contractor on this work, although it was completed for Rs 229-6-0 and the completion bill sent to the Comptroller in may 1900; that the Contractor now claims the difference (Viz Rs 10-15-6) between the amount of work done and that actually paid to him; and requests sanction of Govt (Vide art 5 of the Civil Account Code) to pay the Contractor, the balance still due to him

9 10-14-10

does he state whether the Board was consulted in the matter or not

& to the President does not point out the source in the current years D. F Budget of the

There are no rules on this point.

Subd. This Secs

Sec 27 1. The Dr Gen should point out the budget provision the expenditure could be debited. The work having been closed no provision therefor is made in the budgets of succeeding years — Cheques for petty construction & repair should be adjusted by the Comptr against the budget grants in the Dept concerned — (Please see art 467 para 73 chap 24, Civil Account Code Vol. I)

2. When the budget provision is found payment may be made in the usual course from LBS petty works

Can you kindly find some provision in current budget. The LFSO sanction amt is small — Hrm

N. 21/7/03.

Secy 21/7/03 Dy Secy 21/7 D. F. O. 20/7/3 Q 21/7 N 20/7/03

6

A In G.P. No 487-88 / d. 71-03 Dt 30-7-03, sanction was conveyed for payment to the contractor of Rs 10-14-10, being the balance left after deducting Rs 218-7-2, already paid to him, from the total cost of the wellwork in question (viz Rs 229-6-0)

Now, the President states that the wellwork referred to was closed for Rs 229-6-8 and not for Rs 229-6-0 as erroneously

B entered in his letter No 12X69 Dt 13-5-03.

Draft sanctioning the payment of Rs 10-15-6 instead of Rs 10-14-10 already sanctioned is submitted for approval or other orders

Dt 22/8/03

actually paid, though the work turned out amounted to Rs 229-6-0. The work has been closed for the latter amount and completion bill sent to Comptroller in May 1900. The Contractor now claims the difference of Rs-10-15-6 between the amount of work done and that actually paid to him. The Comptroller who was asked to state whether the amount now claimed could be paid, has replied that Government sanction should be obtained for so doing. The mistake was committed through oversight by the Taluk authorities in the first instance, but as the contractor will have to be paid,

⊕ 229-6-0
218-7-2
10-14-10

⊕

I

I beg that sanction may be accorded for payment of the same viz

Rs 10-15-6.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

[signature]

President